

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 11, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on April 11, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-9 remain pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1, 4 and 9 have been amended by Applicants. New claims 10-20 have been added. Applicants submit that no new matters have been introduced in these amendments. Claims 1-9 stand rejected by the Examiner. Reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested for reasons presented below.

Double Patenting

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,136,163. Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended. Therefore, claims 1-9 are no longer coextensive in scope with claims 1-9 of U.S. Patent No. 6,136,163. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4 and 9 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 and 10 of U.S. Patent No. 6,635,157. In response, Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer and deposit account authorization for the statutory disclaimer fee which obviates the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over pending claims 11-14 of copending Application No. 10/972,884. In response, Applicants submit herewith a terminal disclaimer and deposit account authorization for the statutory disclaimer fee which obviates the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4 provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over pending claims 14 and 18-20 of copending Application No. 11/114,936. In response, Applicants submit herewith a

terminal disclaimer and deposit account authorization for the statutory disclaimer fee which obviates the rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants submit that claim 1 has been amended to correct the editorial error pointed out by the Examiner. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by *Dordi et al* (U.S. Patent Nos. 6,258,220 and 6,635,157) and (U.S. Publication Nos. 2004/0084301 and 2002/0029961).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. Applicants submit that the provisional application of which both U.S. Patent No. 6,258,220 (Publication No. 2004/0084301) and U.S. Patent No. 6,635,157 (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0029961) claimed priority does not include the subject matter of the present invention. Thus, both U.S. Patent Nos. 6,258,220 and 6,635,157 have an effective filing date of April 8, 1999, which is later than March 5, 1999, the effective filing date of the present application. Therefore, U.S. Patent Nos. 6,258,220 and 6,635,157 do not qualify as references. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by *Dordi et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,267,853).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that U.S. Patent No. 6,267,853 was filed on July 9, 1999, which is later than March 5, 1999, the effective filing date of the present application. Therefore, U.S. Patent No. 6,267,853 does not qualify as a reference. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Curtis et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,264,752, hereafter *Curtis*) in view of *Shinbara* (U.S. Patent No. 6,155,275, hereafter *Shinbara*) and *Uzoh et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,123,825, hereafter *Uzoh*).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Curtis teaches an apparatus for processing a microelectronic workpiece in a micro-environment (abstract). Figure 12 of *Curtis* illustrates a processing tool utilizes one or more robotic arms 625 that travel along a linear path 630 to perform required transport operations (column 10 lines 41-43). However, *Curtis* does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, for example, as pointed out by the Examiner that *Curtis* does not suggest a thermal anneal chamber disposed adjacent the loading station.

Shinbara teaches a substrate processing unit having a substrate processing section for processing a substrate held therein while supplying a process fluid to the substrate (abstract). However, *Shinbara* does not teach or suggest the claimed invention, for example, *Shinbara* does not suggest a thermal anneal chamber disposed adjacent the loading station.

Uzoh teaches an electromigration-resistant copper film structure and the process for forming the structure (Abstract). *Uzoh* does not teach or suggest a processing tool as set forth in the present invention.

The combination of *Curtis*, *Shinbara* and *Uzoh* does not teach, show or suggest an electro-chemical deposition system comprising a mainframe having a mainframe wafer transfer robot, a loading station disposed in connection with the mainframe, one or more processing cells disposed in connection with the mainframe, an electrolyte supply fluidly connected to the one or more processing cells, and a thermal anneal chamber disposed adjacent the loading station, as set forth in amended claim 1, and claims dependent thereon. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Curtis* in view of *Shinbara* and *Uzoh* as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of *Togawa et al* (U.S. Patent No. 5,830,045, hereafter *Togawa*).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Curtis, Shinbara and *Uzoh* are discussed above. *Togawa* teaches a polishing apparatus including a storage cassette for storing workpieces to be polished. *Togawa* does not teach or suggest an electro-chemical deposition system as set forth in the present invention. The combination of *Curtis, Shinbara, Uzoh* and *Togawa* does not teach, show or suggest the subject matter set forth in claim 1, on which claim 9 is dependent on. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

New claims 10-20 have been added to further clarified the invention. Applicants submit that no new matter has been introduced in the new claims.

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show, or suggest the invention as claimed.

The secondary references made of record are noted. However, it is believed that the secondary references are no more pertinent to the Applicant's disclosure than the primary references cited in the office action. Therefore, Applicant believes that a detailed discussion of the secondary references is not necessary for a full and complete response to this office action.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,


Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant(s)